

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
DIVISION**

**CHARLES KIMBLE, JR., #2336397,**

*Plaintiff,*

**v.**

**ANGELA JONES, ET AL.,**

*Defendants.*

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

**CIVIL ACTION NO. 6:21-CV-122**

**ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

This action was referred to United States Magistrate Judge K. Nicole Mitchell, who issued a Report and Recommendation (Docket No. 26) concluding that Plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunction (Docket No. 25) should be denied. Plaintiff has filed objections. Docket No. 24

This Court reviews the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge *de novo* only if a party objects within fourteen days of service of the Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In conducting a *de novo* review, the Court examines the entire record and makes an independent assessment under the law. *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (*en banc*), *superseded on other grounds by statute*, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending the time to file objections from ten to fourteen days).


The Court has conducted a careful *de novo* review of the record and the Magistrate Judge's proposed findings and recommendations. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (explaining the district judge shall "make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made."). Having reviewed the Report and Plaintiff's

objections, the Court has determined that the Report is correct, and the objections are without merit. It is accordingly

**ORDERED** that the Report and Recommendation (Docket No. 26) is **ADOPTED**. It is further

**ORDERED** that the motion for preliminary injunction (Docket No. 25) is **DENIED**.

So **ORDERED** and **SIGNED** this **9th** day of **March, 2022**.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JEREMY D. KERNODLE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE